new force is the only explanation; entirely neglecting the great probability of our having overlooked a natural mode of explanation, such as the effect of unconscious suggestion. Again, he values the mere accumulation of evidence, as opposed to the stringency of the evidence, far too highly; and more important than all, when he comes to rule out the element of chance successes he fails of his purpose entirely. To begin with, the only type of experiment in which the success attributable to chance is exactly assignable is that with the cards, which proves entirely negative. In all other cases the action of chance is only roughly estimated, with a large element of subjectivity; and to judge from this article, M. Richet seems very readily disposed to see a marvel in every unusual event. In that portion of the article dealing with coincidences, the frequent though not the less unpardonable mistake is committed of confusing the chances of an event happening at a time determined upon *beforehand* by a third party, and the calculation of the chances *after* the event, without taking into account the prediction of the occurrence. Finally, the fact that success was obtained when the agent did not know the nature of the drawings is not an argument for "lucidity," but an argument against telepathy, and suggests that the subject succeeded in getting a sufficient idea of the nature of the drawing to obtain three times the normal number of successes.

Hat das magnetische Feld directe physiologische Wirkungen? L. HERMANN. Pflüger's Arch. XLIII, 5 and 6, April 24, 1888, pp. 217–235.

The psychologic interest in this paper centres about the alleged powers of the magnet in hypnotic phenonema. Prof. Hermann attacks the problem from a purely physiological side, aiming to discover whether the presence of a strong magnetic field in any ways influences the behavior of sensitive tissue under ordinary stimuli. After calling attention to the fact that in the literature of the subject one finds only negative results, when the results are trustworthy, he recounts his own experiments, which were directed mainly to four points. (1) Is there any difference in the minimal intensity of an induction shock that will cause the contraction of a nerve-muscle preparation, when that preparation is in a magnetic field and when it is not? (2) Is there any difference in the curve of contraction of such a preparation when placed in a magnetic field and when not? (3) Is there any difference in the minimal rate of stimuli that will produce tetanus under the two conditions? (4) Will the curve of tetanic contraction differ in the two cases? To all these questions, the answer obtained from numerous experiments, made with great precaution, is entirely negative. The magnetic field has absolutely no physiological effect whatever. Basing his position on these and similar results (for animals behave perfectly normally in a magnetic field; microscopic functions continue as usual; placing one's head between the poles of a magnet results in no sensation), he launches a severe criticism against the unscientific proceedings of the "hypnotists" who attribute a marvellous influence to the magnet, under conditions anything but conclusive. He emphasizes the extreme improbability of any such result, and regards all such anti-physiological announcements as utterly untrustworthy and an evidence of nothing but the careless observation of the reporter.